

I P S B
INDIANA PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

**Indiana Professional Standards Board
External Committee for School Leaders**

Selections
June 14, 2002

Members Present: John Hill (chairperson), Ed Burkhalter, Roger Thornton, Mike Horvath, Pam Frampton, Kathy Sherman, Peggy Hinckley, Phyllis Amick, Steve Heck, Sue Switzer, Nancy Carey, Deb Lecklider, Becky Libler, Gary Collings (recorder)

Members Absent: Earlene Holland, Dan Grayson, Miriam Matthews, Earl Williams, Cindy Finney

Staff Present: Marie Theobald

Guests Present: Larry Gambaiani (ISU)

The External Committee for School Leaders of the Indiana Professional Standards Board convened at 9:30 AM on June 14, 2002 at the MSD Washington Township Community and Education Center, Indianapolis.

I. Announcements - John Hill, chairperson, called the meeting to order. The selections of the March 8, 2002 meeting were accepted as presented.

II. Update on School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) - John Hill reported that the proposed rule governing the SLLA will be published in the Indiana Register in July 2002 with a time line to go into effect on January 1, 2003.

III. School Leaders Licensure Assessment Waiver - Marie Theobald presented the following two options for language to be inserted into the SLLA rule for those professionals already licensed:

Option #1 - All administrators who obtain an original administration and supervision license after January 1, 2003, and have not passed the SLLA, must successfully complete the exam.

Option #2 - Administrators receiving an original administration and supervision license after January 1, 2003, will be required to successfully complete the SLLA unless they hold a standard, provisional, or professional administration and supervision license in Indiana or the equivalent license in another state and can verify three years of full-time experience in an accredited K-12 school in the appropriate position under that license.

Marie commented that the second option is similar to the language in the teacher rule, which waives the Praxis I and II. She noted that 22 states have now adopted the standards of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and that the standards have been incorporated by NCATE. During the discussion of the two options, members favored Option 2 for its flexibility.

MOTION: Peggy Hinckley moved to accept Option 2 and recommend it to the IPSB. After a second by Kathy Sherman, the motion was unanimously approved.

IV. Update on Portfolio Scoring (Pilot I) - Becky Libler and Deb Lecklider recently attended a portfolio scoring session conducted by Educational Testing Service. Becky reported they learned how important it is for candidates to follow directions, look for key words, and make certain each is addressed. The assessors learned how to evaluate the portfolios by how well the candidate used data and matched the data with goals, activities, and strategies. If the two assessors are not within two points, there is an adjudication process that involves a third assessor. Becky further commented that documentation is important. If the narrative does not match up with the documentation the portfolio will not likely be acceptable. It is the assessor's responsibility to find the evidence, regardless of how the portfolio may be organized. She observed that the portfolio does span all of our administrator positions. In reply to a question, she remarked that it would take too long for Indiana to duplicate and validate a portfolio process keyed to the standards that would be comparable to the ETS model. Becky endorsed the continued use of the ETS portfolio process.

Deb Lecklider was complimentary of the portfolios from Indiana that were distinguished by the demonstrated organizational skills. Most states in the portfolio pilot had two years and Indiana volunteers only had the one-year pilot. She also distributed a State Leadership Academy Network Framework from the Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB).

Marie Theobald said that ETS will next send a survey to the Indiana volunteers who did and did not complete the portfolio. The IPSB will also compile a feedback report to be sent to the ETS. She suggested that the portfolio be revisited at the next meeting. Marie clarified that the portfolio will be used by candidates in the second year of the initial license period.

MOTION: Roger Thornton moved to accept the recommendation for the continued use of the ETS portfolio as a recommendation from the External Committee for School Leaders to the IPSB. After a second by Nancy Carey, the motion was unanimously approved.

V. Update and Report on Pilot I - Deb Lecklider gave the University Consortium report. Eighteen out of 25 volunteers completed a portfolio. Members of the consortium complimented Kathy Sherman for her contribution to the portfolio process. Feedback to the ETS will be that the questions and directions were not clear.

Marie Theobald reviewed the three pilots: Pilot I (portfolio assessment), Pilot II (mentors), and Pilot III (continuing education). She commented that the consortium is also developing the mentoring component (Pilot II), which is the first year of the initial license period. Consortium members are identifying the potential participants and training aspects for this one-year pilot.

Beginning in 2006 the candidate with an initial license will have a mentor team for support and assistance. In the second year the mentor team will guide the candidate through the portfolio process. Candidates must “pass” the portfolio requirement to receive the proficient (five year) license.

Becky Libler suggested that the Pilot II have a subset of 5 volunteers from the “mentees” pool to be paired with mentors in training. These volunteers would also develop a portfolio to enhance the mentor training. Members suggested that the seven (7) volunteers who did not complete the portfolio might be the first to invite to participate in this phase of the pilot.

Members were in support of the subset proposal with approximately 5 mentees from the pilot group to also complete portfolios. The scoring of each portfolio by ETS is approximately \$400. John Hill proposed the consortium should decide if the proposal is feasible. He suggested that the portfolio fees could be paid from the consortium contract amount. Becky Libler will discuss the proposal with Jim Auter.

VI. Report: Subcommittee for Continuing Education (Pilot III) – Gary Collings discussed the highlights of a final report submitted by the Continuing Education Subcommittee for license renewal of school leaders. The report sections included a time line, highlights of the framework, stipulations for the proficient license, expected outcomes for Pilot III, a model for Pilot III, monitoring/reporting/training, and a development and reporting manual.

Members next reviewed the Development and Reporting Manual for the Professional Growth Plan for Building and District Administrators (Version 1.3 dated 6/14/02). It was noted that Ball State is seeking a replacement for Ed Cox on the University Consortium. In Section 4, Marie Theobald wants to inquire about the 36 points (instead of 45 points) for new administrator mentoring on page 6 of the Points Values and Conditions chart. There was discussion about both the self-assessment (Section 6) and Professional Growth Team feedback (Section 7) not impacting on the renewal decision. The consortium is to take these reservations under advisement in its recommendations from the pilot study. Pam Frampton presented some sample narratives with scoring rubrics for the Professional Growth Plan Projection (Section 8). The appendices with both glossary and full set of building and district standards were considered to be beneficial components.

In reply to a question about the scope of Pilot III, Marie Theobald commented that the funds are not currently available to underwrite the components, e.g., the compensation of mentor team advisors and the maintenance of a pool of professionals to be trained. She emphasized that Pilot III must proceed regardless of the financial constraints. Under Section 6 (Monitoring/Reporting/Training) of the subcommittee’s final report an item “i. financial impact” was added for the consortium to address from the pilot results.

MOTION: Kathy Sherman moved to accept the Continuing Education Pilot III and manual as recommended in the subcommittee’s final report. She complimented the subcommittee on its thorough, accurate, and well organized outcomes. After a second by Nancy Carey, the motion was unanimously approved.

VII. Review of Emergency Permits for Administrators - John Hill addressed an item in the approved provisions for emergency permits that appears to be unclear. Under building administrator, a candidate for an emergency permit would be eligible if he/she “completes one year in an approved program and holds a master’s degree”. Roger Thornton added that the wording may allow a candidate to have a non-administrative master’s degree as well as be admitted for one year without completing any coursework.

Marie Theobald thought the master’s degree stipulation was a carry-over from the professionalization requirements of Rules 46/47. As currently written the candidate must first have a master’s degree but it could be in any area. Becky Libler noted that the principals’ training program in the four state universities has been revamped to culminate in a master’s degree. Marie said that she has already asked the consortium to begin a review of this stipulation in the emergency permit provisions. Deb Lecklider added that the consortium feels the “one-year in an approved program” should be interpreted to mean the candidate must have completed 1/3 of the coursework that constitutes his/her preparation program.

Members concluded that the consortium should draft a recommendation for eligibility for an emergency permit as a building administrator. Members, however, were inclined to delete the master’s degree requirement and call for current enrollment in an accredited preparation program as evidenced by a sign-off of the university program representative confirming that the candidate has completed 1/3 (or 1/2) of the program.

NEXT MEETINGS (9:30 AM): August 30, 2002, October 11, 2002, February 14, 2003, and May 9, 2003

MSD WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, COMMUNITY ROOM A & B